arXiv:1210.7491v1 [math.OA] 28 Oct 2012

CP-H-Extendable Maps between Hilbert modules and CPH-Semigroups*

Michael Skeide and K. Sumesh

October 2012

Abstract

One may ask which maps between Hilbert modules allow for a completely positive extension to a map acting block-wise between the associated (extended) linking algebras. In these notes we investigate in particular those of such *CP-extendable maps* whose 22–corner is a homomorphism, the *CP-H-extendable maps*. We show that they coincide with the maps considered by Asadi [Asa09], by Bhat, Ramesh, and Sumesh [BRS12], and by Skeide [Ske10]. We also give an intrinsic characterization that generalizes the characterization by Abbaspour and Skeide [AS07] of homomorphicly extendable maps as those which are ternary homomorphisms. For general *strictly* CP-extendable maps we give a factorization theorem that generalizes those of Asadi, of Bhat, Ramesh, and Sumesh, and of Skeide for CP-H-extendable maps. As an application, we examine semigroups of CP-H-extendable maps, so-called *CPH-semigroups*, and illustrate their relation with a sort of generalized dilation of CP-semigroups, *CPH-dilations*.

1 Introduction

Let $\tau\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ be a linear map between C^*–algebras $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. A ***τ–map*** is map $T\colon E \to F$ from a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module E to a Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module F such that

$$\langle T(x), T(x')\rangle \;=\; \tau(\langle x, x'\rangle). \tag{$*$}$$

After several publications about τ–maps where τ was required to be a homomorphism (for instance, Bakic and Guljas [BG02], Skeide [Ske06b], Abbaspour Tabadkan and Skeide [AS07]), and others where τ was required to be just a CP-map (for instance, Asadi [Asa09], Bhat, Ramesh, and Sumesh [BRS12], Skeide [Ske10]), we think it is now time to determine the general structure of τ–maps. We also think it is time to, finally, give some idea what τ–maps might be good for. While we succeed completely with our first task for bounded τ, we hope that

---

[*] AMS 2000 subject classification 46L08, 46L55, 46L53, 60G25

our small application in connection with dilations of CP-semigroups can provide some better feeling about these maps.

Now, if a map T fulfills $(*)$ for some linear map τ, then T is linear. (Simply examine $|T(x+\lambda x')-T(x)-\lambda T(x')|^2$.) Furthermore, if τ is bounded, then, obviously, T is bounded with norm $\|T\| \leq \sqrt{\|\tau\|}$. As easily, one checks that the ***inflation*** $T_n\colon M_n(E)\to M_n(F)$ of T (that is, T acting element-wise on the matrix) is a τ_n–map for the inflation $\tau_n\colon M_n(\mathcal{B})\to M_n(\mathcal{C})$ of τ. (Recall that $M_n(E)$ is a Hilbert $M_n(\mathcal{B})$–module with inner product $(\langle X,Y\rangle)_{i,j} := \sum_k\langle x_{ki},y_{kj}\rangle$.) Therefore, $\|T_n\| \leq \sqrt{\|\tau_n\|}$.

A map τ fulfilling $(*)$ (and, therefore, also τ_n) "looks" positive. (In fact, at least positive elements of the form $\langle x,x\rangle$ are sent to the positive elements $\langle T(x),T(x)\rangle$.) More precisely, it looks positive on the ideal $\operatorname{span}\langle E,E\rangle$. It is not difficult to show (see Lemma 2.8) that bounded τ is, actually, positive on the ***range ideal*** $\mathcal{B}_E := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\langle E,E\rangle$ of E. Since the same is true also for τ_n, we see that τ is ***completely positive*** (or ***CP***) on $\mathcal{B}_E$. Recall that for CP-maps τ we have $\|\tau_n\| = \|\tau\|$.

We arrive at our first new result.

1.1 Theorem. *Let $T\colon E\to F$ be a map from a* **full** *Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module E (that is, $\mathcal{B}_E=\mathcal{B}$) to a Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module F, and let $\tau\colon\mathcal{B}\to\mathcal{C}$ be a bounded linear map. If T a τ–map, then τ is completely positive. Moreover, T is linear and completely bounded with* **CB-norm** $\|T\|_{cb} := \sup_n\|T_n\| = \sqrt{\|\tau\|}$.

The only missing part, namely, that the CB-norm $\|T\|_{cb}$ actually reaches its bound $\sqrt{\|\tau\|}$, we prove in Lemma 2.13.

It is, in general, not true that $\|T\|_{cb} = \|T\|$, not even if $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are unital.[a] It is true, if E has a ***unit vector*** ξ (that is, $\langle\xi,\xi\rangle = \mathbf{1}$); see Observation 2.12.

1.2 Example. Let $H\neq\{0\}$ be a Hilbert space with ONB $(e_i)_{i\in I}$. For E we choose the full Hilbert $\mathcal{K}(H)$–module H^* (with inner product $\langle x'^*,x^*\rangle := x'x^*$). For F we choose H. So, $\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{K}(H)$ and $\mathcal{C}=\mathbb{C}$. Let T be the ***transpose map*** with respect to the ONB. That is, T sends the "row vector" $x^t=\sum_i x_ie_i^*$ in E to the "column vector" $x=(x^t)^t=\sum_i x_ie_i$ in F. Of course, $\|T\|=1$.

A linear map $\tau\colon\mathcal{K}(H)\to\mathbb{C}$ turning T into a τ–map, would send $e_ie_j^*$ to $\tau(\langle e_i^*,e_j^*\rangle) = \langle T(e_i^*),T(e_j^*)\rangle = \langle e_i,e_j\rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. So, on the finite-rank operators $\mathcal{F}(H)$ the map τ is bound to be the (non-normalized) ***trace*** $\operatorname{Tr} := \sum_i\langle e_i,\bullet e_i\rangle$. Recall that $\|\operatorname{Tr}\| = \dim H$. This shows several things:

1. Suppose H is infinite-dimensional. Then τ cannot be bounded. Since positive maps are bounded, there cannot be whatsoever positive map τ turning T into a τ–map. (Of course,

---

[a] This contradicts the proposition in Asadi [Asa09].

we can extend $\tau = \mathsf{Tr}$ by brute-force linear algebra from $\mathcal{F}(E)$ to $\mathcal{K}(E)$, so that T is still a τ–map with unbounded and non-positive τ.)

2. Suppose H is n–dimensional (so that, in particular, $\mathcal{K}(H) = M_n$ is unital). The column vector X^{*n} in H^{*n} with entries $e_1^*, \ldots, e_n^*$ has square modulus $\langle X^{*n}, X^{*n} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i e_i^*$. So, $\|X^{*n}\| = \sqrt{\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n e_i e_i^*\right\|} = 1$. However, the norm of the column vector Y^n with entries $T(e_1^*) = e_1, \ldots, T(e_n^*) = e_n$ is $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \langle e_i, e_i \rangle} = \sqrt{n}$. Since $M_n(H^*) \supset M_{n,1}(H^*) = H^{*n}$, we find $\|T\|_{cb} \geq \|T_n\| \geq \sqrt{n}$. On the other hand, by the discussion preceding Theorem 1.1, $\|T\|_{cb} \leq \sqrt{\|\tau\|} = \sqrt{n}$. Therefore, $\|T\|_{cb} = \sqrt{n}$, while $\|T\| = 1 \neq \|T\|_{cb}$ for $n \geq 2$.

Whenever $\mathcal{B}_E$ is unital, τ is bounded (and, therefore, completely bounded) on $\mathcal{B}_E = \mathsf{span}\langle E, E \rangle$; see again Observation 2.12.

To summarize: If E is full and if τ is bounded, then CP is automatic. And if E is full over a unital C^*–algebra, then we have not even to require that τ is bounded, assuming it coincides with the unique bounded extension of $\tau \upharpoonright \mathsf{span}\langle E, E \rangle$. On the other hand, some of the questions we wish to tackle, have nice answers for CP-maps τ, even if E is not full. And τ–maps T (into the Hilbert $\mathcal{B}(G)$–module $F = \mathcal{B}(G, H)$) for completely positive τ (into $C = \mathcal{B}(G)$) is also what Asadi started analyzing in [Asa09]. So, after these considerations, for the rest of these notes τ will **always** be a CP-map.

• • •

A basic task of these notes is to characterize τ–maps for CP-maps τ. More precisely, we wish to find criteria that tell us when a map $T \colon E \to F$ is a τ–map for some CP-map τ **without** knowing τ, just by looking at T.

The case, when a possible τ is required to be a homomorphism has been resolved by Abbaspour Tabadkan and Skeide [AS07]. (In this case, T has been called ***τ–homomorphism*** in Bakic and Guljas [BG02] or a ***τ–isometry***.) For full E, [AS07, Theorem 2.1] asserts: T is a τ–isometry for some homomorphism τ if and only if T is linear and fulfills

$$T(x\langle y, z \rangle) = T(x)\langle T(y), T(z) \rangle,$$

that is, if T is a ***ternary homomorphism***.[b] (Ternary homomorphisms into $\mathcal{B}(G, H)$ (G and H Hilbert spaces) occurred under the name ***representation*** of a Hilbert module (and the unnecessary hypothesis of complete boundedness) in Skeide [Ske00].) Another equivalent criterion is that T extends as a homomorphism acting block-wise between the linking algebras of E and of F. (This follows simply by applying [AS07, Theorem 2.1] also to the ternary homomorphism

---

[b] We should emphasize that, unlike stated in [AS07], linearity of T **cannot** be dropped. The map $T \colon E \to \mathbb{C}$ defined as $T(x) = 1$ is a counter example. Indeed, without linearity, the map $\tau = \varphi$ defined in the proof of [AS07, Theorem 2.1] is a well-defined multiplicative $*$–map; but it may fail to be linear.

$T^*\colon E^* \to F^*$ from the full Hilbert $\mathcal{K}(E)$–module E^* to the full Hilbert $\mathcal{K}(F)$–module F^* defined as $T^*(x^*) := T(x)^*$, resulting in a homomorphism $\vartheta\colon \mathcal{K}(E) \to \mathcal{K}(F)$ so that the block-wise map

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{pmatrix} \colon \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathcal{K}(E) \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & F^* \\ F & \mathcal{K}(F) \end{pmatrix}$$

is a homomorphism.) We would call such maps ***H-extendable***.

It is always a good idea to look at properties of Hilbert modules in terms of properties of their linking algebras. (For instance, Skeide [Ske00] defined a Hilbert module E over a von Neumann algebra to be a *von Neumann module* if its extended linking algebra is a von Neumann algebra in a canonically associated representation. This happens if and only if E is self-dual, that is, if E is a W^*–module.) Likewise, it is a good idea to look at properties of maps between Hilbert modules in terms of how they may be extended to block-wise maps between their linking algebras. (For instance, many maps between von Neumann modules are σ–weakly continuous if and only if they allow for a normal (that is, order continuous) block-wise extension to a map between the linking algebras.) In addition to the usual ***linking algebra*** $\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathcal{K}(E) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{K}\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} \\ E \end{pmatrix}$ of a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module E, it is sometimes useful to look at the ***reduced linking algebra*** $\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B}_E & E^* \\ E & \mathcal{K}(E) \end{pmatrix}$ or at the ***extended linking algebra*** $\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathcal{B}^a(E) \end{pmatrix}$. It would be tempting to see if τ–maps are precisely the ***CP-extendable maps***, that is, maps that allow for some block-wise CP-extension between some sort of linking algebras. Unfortunately, this is not so: There are more CP-extendable maps than τ–maps; see Section 2. We, therefore, strongly object to use the name *CP-maps* between Hilbert modules as meaning τ–maps, which was proposed recently by several authors; see, for instance, Heo and Ji [HJ11], or Joita [Joi12].

But if CP-extendable is not the right condition, what is the right condition? And what is the right "intrinsic condition" replacing the ternary condition for τ–isometries? As a main result of these notes, in Section 2 we proof the following theorem.

1.3 Theorem. *Let E be a full Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module and let F be a Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module. Let $T\colon E \to F$ be a linear map and denote $F_T := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\, T(E)\mathcal{C}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *There exists a (unique) CP-map $\tau\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ such that T is a τ–map.*

2. *T extends to a block-wise CP-map $\mathfrak{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{pmatrix} \colon \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathcal{B}^a(E) \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & F_T^* \\ F_T & \mathcal{B}^a(F_T) \end{pmatrix}$ where ϑ is a homomorphism, that is, T is a* ***CP-H-extendable map*** *.*

3. *T is a completely bounded map and F_T can be turned into a $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$– correspondence in such a way that T is left $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–linear.*

4. *T is a completely bounded map fulfilling*

$$\big\langle T(y), T(x\langle x', y'\rangle)\big\rangle = \big\langle T(x'\langle x, y\rangle), T(y')\big\rangle. \tag{$**$}$$

A more readable version of $(**)$ is

$$\langle T(y), T(xx'^*y')\rangle \;=\; \langle T(x'x^*y), T(y')\rangle.$$

This ***quaternary condition*** is the intrinsic condition we were seeking, and which generalizes the ternary condition guaranteeing that T is τ–isometry.

1.4 Observation.

1. The homomorphism ϑ in (2) coincides with the left action in (3); see the proof of (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) in Section 2.

2. Since the set $T(E)$ generates the Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module F_T, the left action in (3) (and, consequently, also ϑ in (2)) is uniquely determined by $(xy^*)T(z) = T(xy^*z)$. In fact, this formula shows that the finite-rank operators $\mathcal{F}(E)$ act nondegenerately on F_T, so there is a unique extension to all of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$. Moreover, this unique extension is strict and unital; see the proof of Lemma 3.1.

3. It is routine to show that $(**)$ well-defines a nondegenerate action of $\mathcal{F}(E)$. So, the same argument also shows that (3) and (4) are equivalent.

4. Clearly, Example 1.2(1) shows that the condition on T to be completely bounded in (3) and (4), may not be dropped. However, if E is full over a unital C^*–algebra, then T just linear is sufficient; see again Observation 2.12 .

1.5 Remark. It should be noted that the CP-map τ in (2) need not coincide with the map τ in (1) making T a τ–map. (Just add an arbitrary CP-map $\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ to the latter.) Likewise, having a CP-extension $\mathfrak{T}$ with a non-homomorphic 22–corner ϑ does not necessarily mean that it is not possible to get a CP-H-extension by modifying ϑ.

1.6 Remark. Unlike for τ–isometries, for more general τ–maps the homomorphism ϑ in (2) will only rarely map the compacts $\mathcal{K}(E)$ into the compacts $\mathcal{K}(F_T)$. So, in (2) it is forced that we pass to the extended linking algebras. Also considerations about the strict topology cannot be avoided completely.

1.7 Remark. We already know that a τ–map T is linear, so linearity of T may be dropped from (1). We know from the example in Footnote [b] that linearity may not be dropped from (4), not even if T fulfills the stronger ternary condition. Linearity may be dropped from (3), if E contains a unit vector ξ (or, more generally, a direct summand $\mathcal{B}$), for in that case we have $T(x) = T(x\xi^*\xi) = (x\xi^*)T(\xi)$, which is linear in x. However, unlike in Observation 1.4(4), we were not even able to safe the statement for unital $\mathcal{B}$.

The property in (3) is almost visible from a glance at $(*)$. In fact, we try to assign a value $\langle T(x), T(x')\rangle$ to the element $\langle x, x'\rangle \in \mathscr{B}_E = E^* \odot E$. (Here E^* is the ***dual*** Hilbert $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–module of E with inner product $\langle x'^*, x^*\rangle := x'x^*$, and the tensor product is over the canonical left action of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ on E.) It is clear that the map $(x, x') \mapsto \langle T(x), T(x')\rangle$ has to be balanced over $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ if there should exist τ fulfilling $(*)$. And if there was a suitable left action of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ on F_T, then we would be concerned with the map $\tau := T^* \odot T$. People knowing the module Haagerup tensor product of operator modules and Blecher's result [Ble97, Theorem 4.3] that the Haagerup tensor product is (completely) isometrically isomorphic to the tensor product of correspondences, can already smell that everything is fine. We shall give a direct proof in Section 2. Actually, our method will provide us with a quick proof of Blecher's result.

• • •

We have seen in Theorem 1.3 that the submodule F_T of F generated by $T(E)$ plays a distinguished role. (If T is a τ–isometry, then $T(E)$ is already a closed $\tau(\mathscr{B})$–submodule of F.) But we may ask in how far the condition in (2) remains true if we write F instead of F_T.

1.8 Definition. A ***CPH-map*** from E to F is a map that extends as a block-wise CP-map between the extended linking algebras of E and of F such that the 22–corner is a homomorphism. A CPH-map is ***strictly CPH*** if that homomorphism can be chosen strict. A (strictly) CPH-map is a (***strictly***) ***CPH$_0$-map*** if the homomorphism ϑ can be chosen unital.

CPH-maps are CP-H-extendable (Lemma 2.7). If F_T is complemented in F, then T is a CPH-map if and only if it is CP-H-extendable. (In that case, $\mathcal{B}^a(F_T)$ is a corner of $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$, so that ϑ may be considered a map into $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$.) But this condition is not at all necessary, nor natural; see Section 4.

Despite the fact that there are fewer CPH-maps than CP-H-extendable maps, looking at CPH-maps is particularly crucial if we wish to look a semigroups of CP-H-extendable maps T_t on E. Obviously, for full E, the associated CP-maps τ_t form a CP-semigroup. But there is no chance to ask the same question for the homomorphisms ϑ_t, if the ϑ_t do not map into $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$. And if E_{T_t} is not complemented in E, then, in general, it is not possible to grant that ϑ_s can be considered a map defined on $\mathcal{B}^a(E_{T_t})$ in order to make sense out of $\vartheta_s \circ \vartheta_t$.

In Section 4 we study such ***CPH-semigroups***. We introduce the new concept of ***CPH-dilation*** of a CP-map or a CP-semigroup. We examine its relations with the theory of tensor product systems of correspondences initiated Bhat and Skeide [BS00] (following Arveson [Arv89] for Hilbert spaces). And we point out some relations with (completely positive definite) ***CPD-kernels*** and with ***Morita equivalence***. This section is, however, not intended to be much more than a hint that CPH-maps might be useful. Still, to our knowledge, it is the first such hint.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Equivalence of 3 and 4 has already been dealt with in Observation 1.4. For the remaining steps we shall follow the order $1 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 1$. Since we also wish to make comments on the mechanisms of some steps or how parts of the proof are applicable in more general situations, we put each of the steps into an own subsection and indicate by "$\blacksquare$" where the part specific to Theorem 1.3 ends.

In Section 3, we present an alternative direct proof of $2 \Rightarrow 1$, which avoids using arguments originating in operator spaces as involved the proof $3 \Rightarrow 1$.

Proof $1 \Longrightarrow 2$

We first consider the case where $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are unital, but without requiring that E is full. So let $\tau\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ be a CP-map between unital C^*–algebras, and let $T\colon E \to F$ be a τ–map from an arbitrary Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module E to a Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module F.

By Paschke's ***GNS-construction*** [Pas73] for τ, we get a pair $(\mathcal{F}, \zeta)$ consisting of ***GNS-correspondence*** $\mathcal{F}$ from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{C}$ and ***cyclic vector*** ζ in $\mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\langle \zeta, \bullet \zeta \rangle \;=\; \tau, \qquad\qquad \overline{\mathsf{span}}\,\mathcal{B}\zeta\mathcal{C} \;=\; \mathcal{F}.$$

One easily verifies that the map

$$x \odot \zeta \;\longmapsto\; T(x)$$

defines an isometry $v\colon E \odot \mathcal{F} \to F$. (It maps $x \odot (b\zeta c) = ((xb) \odot \zeta)c$ to $T(xb)c$.) In other words, T factors as $T = v(\bullet \odot \zeta)$. (We just have reproduced the simple proof of the "only if" direction of the theorem in Skeide [Ske10].)

Now, v is obviously a unitary onto $F_T := \overline{\mathsf{span}}\,T(E)\mathcal{C}$. So $\vartheta := v(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})v^*$ defines a (unital and strict) homomorphism $\mathcal{B}^a(E) \to \mathcal{B}^a(F_T)$. Identifying $\mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{B}^a(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F})$ via $y\colon c \mapsto yc$ and identifying $\mathcal{B} \odot \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{F}$ via $b \odot y \mapsto by$, we may define a map

$$\Xi \;:=\; \begin{pmatrix} \zeta & \\ & v^* \end{pmatrix} \;\in\; \mathcal{B}^a\left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} \\ F_T \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} \\ E \end{pmatrix} \odot \mathcal{F}\right).$$

Obviously, the map $\mathfrak{T} := \Xi^*(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})\Xi$ from the extended linking algebra of E into the extended linking algebra of F_T is completely positive. One easily verifies that

$$\mathfrak{T} \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{pmatrix},$$

where $T^*(x^*) := T(x)^*$. This proves $1 \Rightarrow 2$ for unital C^*–algebras but not necessarily full E.

Now suppose $\mathcal{B}$ is not necessarily unital. (Nonunital $\mathcal{C}$ may always be "repaired" by appropriate use of approximate units.) The following is folklore.

2.1 Lemma. *If $\tau\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ is a CP-map, then the map $\widetilde{\tau}\colon \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ between the unitalizations of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$, defined by*

$$\widetilde{\tau} \upharpoonright \mathcal{B} := \tau, \qquad\qquad \widetilde{\tau}(\widetilde{\mathbf{1}}) := \|\tau\|\,\widetilde{\mathbf{1}},$$

is a CP-map, too.

Proof. Denote by $\delta\colon \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \to \mathbb{C}$ the unique character vanishing on $\mathcal{B}$, and choose a contractive approximate unit $(u_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ for $\mathcal{B}$. Then the maps

$$\tau_\lambda := \tau(u_\lambda^* \bullet u_\lambda) + (\|\tau\|\,\widetilde{\mathbf{1}} - \tau(u_\lambda^* u_\lambda))\delta$$

are CP-maps (as sum of CP-maps) and converge pointwise to $\widetilde{\tau}$. Therefore, $\widetilde{\tau}$ is a CP-map, too. ■

Now, E and F are also modules over the unitalizations, and T is a $\widetilde{\tau}$–map, too. Since in the first part E was not required full, we may apply the result and get a CP-map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{T}}$ that, obviously, restricts to the desired CP-map $\mathfrak{T}$. This concludes the proof $1 \Rightarrow 2$. ■

2.2 Observation. Obviously, the proof shows that the conclusion $1 \Rightarrow 2$ holds in general, even if E is not full: All τ–maps are CP-H-extendable.

2.3 Observation. Adding the obvious statement that for each $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{F}$ and for each vector $\zeta \in \mathcal{F}$, an isometry $v\colon E \odot \mathcal{F} \to F$ gives rise to a τ–map $T := v(\bullet \odot \zeta)$ for the CP-map $\tau := \langle \zeta, \bullet\zeta \rangle$, we also get the "if" direction of the theorem in [Ske10]. For this it is not necessary that $\mathcal{F}$ is the GNS-correspondence of τ. This observation provides us with many CPH-maps. It also plays a role Section 4.

2.4 Remark. The theorem in Skeide [Ske10] is the last and most general version of a result, first, stated by Asadi [Asa09] for unital CP-maps into $\mathcal{C} = \mathscr{B}(G)$ and T mapping into $F = \mathscr{B}(G, H)$ (G and H Hilbert spaces) under the extra condition that $T(\xi)T(\xi)^* = \mathsf{id}_F$ for some $\xi \in E$ and, then, proved by Bhat, Ramesh, and Sumesh [BRS12] (without the extra condition and for $\mathcal{B}$ still unital, but τ non necessarily unital).

Proof 2 $\Longrightarrow$ 3

Let $T\colon E \to F$ be a map from a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–modules E to a Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module F. Define the map $T^*\colon x^* \mapsto T(x)^*$, and put $F_T := \overline{\mathsf{span}}\, T(E)\mathcal{C}$. Suppose we find a CP-map $\tau\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ and a homomorphism $\vartheta\colon \mathscr{B}^a(E) \to \mathscr{B}^a(F_T)$ such that $\mathfrak{T} := \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{smallmatrix}\right)\colon \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathscr{B}^a(E) \end{smallmatrix}\right) \to \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{C} & F_T^* \\ F_T & \mathscr{B}^a(F_T) \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is a CP-map. So, in partucular, T is a CB-map.

2.5 Lemma. *Let $S\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ be a CP-map between C^*–algebras $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is a C^*–subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}$ with unit $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that the restriction $\vartheta := S \upharpoonright \mathcal{A}$ of S to $\mathcal{A}$ is a homomorphism. Then*

$$S(ba) = S(b\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}})\vartheta(a), \qquad\qquad S(ab) = \vartheta(a)S(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}b)$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are unital. (Otherwise, unitalize as explained in Lemma 2.1 and observe that also the unitalization $\widetilde{S}$ fulfills the hypotheses for $\mathcal{A} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with the same ϑ. If the statement is true for $\widetilde{S}$, then so it is for $S = \widetilde{S} \upharpoonright \mathcal{B}$.)

Let $(\mathcal{F}, \zeta)$ denote the GNS construction for S. By the stated properties, one easily verifies that $|a\zeta - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}\zeta\vartheta(a)|^2 = 0$, so, $a\zeta = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}\zeta\vartheta(a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The first equation of the lemma follows by computing $S(ba) = \langle\zeta, ba\zeta\rangle$, and the second by taking its adjoint. ■

By applying Lemma 2.5 to the CP-map $\mathfrak{T}\colon \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathcal{B}^a(E) \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & F_T^* \\ F_T & \mathcal{B}^a(F_T) \end{pmatrix}$ with the subalgebra $\mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{B}^a(E) \end{pmatrix} \ni \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{id}_E \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ T(ax) & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \mathfrak{T}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \vartheta(a) \end{pmatrix}\mathfrak{T}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \vartheta(a)T(x) & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

thus $T(ax) = \vartheta(a)T(x)$ for all $x \in E$ and $a \in \mathcal{B}^a(E)$. This proves 2 ⇒ 3. ■

2.6 Observation. Also here we did not require that E is full. So 2 ⇒ 3 is true for all CP-H-extendable maps.

Effectively, for the conclusion $T(ax) = \vartheta(a)T(a)$, we did not even need that $\mathfrak{T}$ maps into the linking algebra of F_T. The conclusion remains true for all CPH-maps, so that for a CPH-map the subspace F_T of F reduces ϑ.

2.7 Corollary. *A CPH-map $T\colon E \to F$ is CP-H-extendable.*

This also follows via CPH ⇒ 3 ⇒ 1 ⇒ 2, as soon as we have completed the step 3 ⇒ 1.

Proof 3 $\Longrightarrow$ 1

Given T and a left action of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ on F_T such that $aT(x) = T(ax)$, our scope is to define τ by $(*)$. So, in this part it is essential that E is full. Our job will be to show that the hypotheses of 3, which showed already to be necessary, are also sufficient.

As mentioned in the introduction, in the case $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_E = E^* \odot E$, the map τ, if it exists, appears to be the map

$$\mathcal{B} = E^* \odot E \xrightarrow{T^* \odot T} F^* \odot F = \mathcal{C}_F \subset \mathcal{C}.$$

Note that, since $F_T^* \odot F_T \subset F^* \odot F$ isometrically, it does not matter if we start as in 3 with the hypothesis that F_T is a correspondence making T left $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–linear, or with the hypothesis that F itself is a correspondence making T left $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–linear. (Also strictness does not play any role here.) So, let F be a $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence such that T is left $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–linear. Likewise, $T^* := * \circ T \circ *$ is a right $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–linear map for the corresponding $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–module structures of E^* and F^*. So, $T^* \odot T$, indeed, defines a linear map from the algebraic tensor product $E^* \underline{\odot} E$ over $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ into $F^* \odot F$. And by Lance [Lan95, Proposition 4.5], we have $E^* \underline{\odot} E = \operatorname{span}\langle E, E\rangle$ as subset of $E^* \odot E = \mathcal{B}$.

Once $\tau\colon E^* \underline{\odot} E \to \mathcal{C}$ is bounded (for the norm of the internal tensor product $E^* \odot E$ on $E^* \underline{\odot} E \subset E^* \odot E$), Theorem 1.1 asserts that the extension to $\mathcal{B} = E^* \odot E$ is completely positive. It is time now, to insert the missing piece in the proof of that theorem, which we still owe the reader.

2.8 Lemma. *Let $\tau\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ be a bounded linear map fulfilling $(*)$ for some map $T\colon E \to F$. Then τ is positive on $\mathcal{B}_E$.*

Proof. We already said that T being a τ–map, also T_n is a τ_n–map. Similarly, $T^n\colon E^n \to F^n$ is a τ–map itself. Let us choose a bounded approximate unit $(u_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ for $\mathcal{B}_E$ consisting of elements $u_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\lambda}\langle x_i^\lambda, y_i^\lambda\rangle \in \mathcal{B}_E$. Defining the elements $X_\lambda \in E^{n_\lambda}$ with entries x_i^λ and, similarly, Y_λ, we get $u_\lambda = \langle X_\lambda, Y_\lambda\rangle$. For any positive element bb^* in $\mathcal{B}_E$, denote by $a_\lambda \in \mathcal{K}(E^{n_\lambda})$ the positive square root of the rank-one operator $X_\lambda bb^* X_\lambda^* = (X_\lambda b)(X_\lambda b)^*$. Then

$$\tau(u_\lambda^* bb^* u_\lambda) \;=\; \tau(\langle a_\lambda Y_\lambda, a_\lambda Y_\lambda\rangle) \;=\; \langle T^{n_\lambda}(a_\lambda Y_\lambda), T^{n_\lambda}(a_\lambda Y_\lambda)\rangle \;\geq\; 0.$$

Since $u_\lambda^* bb^* u_\lambda \to bb^*$ in norm, and since τ is bounded, we get $\tau(bb^*) \geq 0$. ■

So it remains to show that τ is bounded on $E^* \underline{\odot} E$. Care is in place, however, as in several respects, $T^* \odot T$ is **not** just the usual tensoring of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–linear maps on internal tensor products of correspondences. Firstly, T is left linear but, in general, not bilinear. (If T was bilinear, it was a τ–isometry.) Secondly, F^* is a Banach right $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–module for which T^* is right $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–linear, but F^* is not a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–module. So, thirdly, $F^* \odot F$ is not an internal tensor product over $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$.

The proof of boundedness can be done by appealing to the module Haagerup tensor product and Blecher's result [Ble97, Theorem 4.3] that the internal tensor product of correspondences is completely isometricly the same as their module Haagerup tensor product. (Indeed, the universal property of the module Haagerup tensor product guarantees that the map $T^* \odot T$ between the module Haagerup tensor norms on the tensor products $E^* \underline{\odot} E$ and $F^* \underline{\odot} F$ over $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ is completely bounded with $\|T^* \odot T\|_{cb} \leq \|T^*\|_{cb}\,\|T\|_{cb}$. The Haagerup seminorm on $F^* \otimes F$ with amalgamation over $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$, which is homomorphic to a subset of $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$, is bigger than the Haagerup seminorm with amalgamation over $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$. So, together with Blecher's result we get that the CB-norm of τ as map between the internal tensor products is not bigger than $\|T^*\|_{cb}\,\|T\|_{cb}$.) But we prefer to give a direct independent proof.

Let $u = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^* \odot y_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i, y_i\rangle \in E^* \underline{\odot} E = \operatorname{span}\langle E, E\rangle$. For the elements X^n and Y^n in E^n with entries x_i and y_i, respectively, this reads $u = \langle X^n, Y^n\rangle$. We get $(T^* \odot T)(u) = \langle T^n(X^n), T^n(Y^n)\rangle$. Consequently,

$$\|(T^* \odot T)(u)\| \;=\; \|\langle T^n(X^n), T^n(Y^n)\rangle\| \;\leq\; \|T^n\|^2\,\|X^n\|\,\|Y^n\| \;\leq\; \|T\|_{cb}^2\,\|X^n\|\,\|Y^n\|\,.$$

If, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find X_ε and Y_ε in E^n such that $\langle X_\varepsilon, Y_\varepsilon\rangle = u$ and $\|X_\varepsilon\|\,\|Y_\varepsilon\| \leq \|u\| + \varepsilon$, then we obtain

$$\|(T^* \odot T)(u)\| \;\leq\; \|T\|_{cb}^2\,\|X_\varepsilon\|\,\|Y_\varepsilon\| \;\leq\; \|T\|_{cb}^2\,(\|u\| + \varepsilon),$$

and further $\|T^* \odot T\| \leq \|T\|_{cb}^2$, by letting $\varepsilon \to 0$.

For showing that this is possible, we recall the following well-known result. (See, for instance, Lance [Lan95, Lemma 4.4].)

2.9 Lemma. *For every element x in a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$-module E and for every $\alpha \in (0,1)$ there is an element $w_\alpha \in E$ such that $x = w_\alpha\,|x|^\alpha$.*

The proof in [Lan95] shows that w_α can be chosen in the Hilbert $C^*(|x|)$–module $\overline{xC^*(|x|)}$, which is isomorphic to $C^*(|x|)$ via $x \mapsto |x|$. Since $|x|^\alpha$ is strictly positive in the C^*–algebra $C^*(|x|)$, the element $w_\alpha \in \overline{xC^*(|x|)}$ is unique and, obviously, when represented in $C^*(|x|)$ it is $w_\alpha = |x|^{1-\alpha}$.

2.10 Corollary. *Let E be a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$-module and let F be a $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence. Choose $x \in E$, $y \in F$ and put $u := x \odot y$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $x_\varepsilon \in E$ and $y_\varepsilon \in F$ such that $x_\varepsilon \odot y_\varepsilon = u$ and*

$$\|x_\varepsilon\|\,\|y_\varepsilon\| \leq \|u\| + \varepsilon,$$

that is, $\|x \odot y\| = \inf\{\,\|x'\|\,\|y'\| : x' \in E, y' \in F, x' \odot y' = x \odot y\,\}$.

Proof. We have $u = x \odot y = w_\alpha \odot |x|^\alpha\, y$ so that

$$\|u\| \;\leq\; \|w_\alpha\|\;\|\,|x|^\alpha\, y\,\| \;\xrightarrow{\alpha\to 1}\; 1 \cdot \|\,|x|\,y\,\| \;=\; \|x \odot y\| \;=\; \|u\|\,,$$

since $\|w_\alpha\| = \sup_{\lambda\in[0,\|x\|]} \lambda^{1-\alpha} = \|x\|^{1-\alpha} \to 1$, and since $|x|^\alpha$ converges in norm to $|x|$. ∎

With the proof of this corollary we did not only **conclude** the proof of 3 ⇒ 1, but also the **proof of Theorem 1.3**. ∎

2.11 Corollary [Ble97, Theorem 4.3]. *The internal tensor product norm of $u \in E \underline{\odot} F$ is*

$$\|u\| \;=\; \inf\Big\{\,\|X_n\|\,\|Y^n\| :\; n \in \mathbb{N},\; X_n \in E_n,\; Y^n \in F^n,\; X_n \odot Y^n = u\Big\}, \tag{2.1}$$

with the row space $E_n := M_{1,n}(E)$ *and the internal tensor product* $X_n \odot Y^n$ *over* $M_n(\mathcal{B})$*. That is, the internal tensor product norm coincides with the module Haagerup tensor product norm (which defined by* (2.1)*). Moreover, since* $M_n(E \odot F)$ *is isomorphic to the internal tensor product* $M_n(E) \odot M_n(F)$*, the internal tensor product is completely isometricly isomorphic to the module Haagerup tensor product.*

After this digression on the Haagerup tensor product, let us return to maps fulfilling 3. However, we weaken the conditions a bit. Firstly, we replace F_T with F, so that now F is a $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence fulfilling $T(ax) = aT(x) =: \vartheta(a)x$. We still may define the map $T^* \odot T$ on $E^* \underline{\odot} E = \operatorname{span}\langle E, E\rangle$, and if T is CB, everything goes as before. Secondly, we wish to weaken the boundedness condition on T. We know from Example 1.2 that if $\mathcal{B}_E$ is nonunital, the CB-condition is indispensable. So, suppose that E is full and that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_E$ is unital.

2.12 Observation. In the prescribed situation, suppose E has a unit vector ξ. In that case, $\tau := T^* \odot T$ is defined on all $\mathcal{B} = \langle \xi, \xi\rangle \mathcal{B} \subset \operatorname{span} E^* \underline{\odot} E \subset \mathcal{B}$. Since $\tau(b^*b) = \tau(b^*\langle \xi, \xi\rangle b) = \langle (T(\xi b), T(\xi b)\rangle$ is positive, τ is bounded by $\|\tau(\mathbf{1})\|$. From $T(x) = T(x\langle \xi, \xi\rangle) = (x\xi^*)T(\xi)$, we conclude that $\|T(x)\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2 \, \|\tau(\mathbf{1})\|$. (This is the same trick in Remark 1.7 that allowed to show that a map $T\colon E \to F$ fulfilling 3 without boundedness and linearity, is linear provided E has a unit vector ξ.)

Even if E has no unit vector but $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_E$ still is unital, then a well-known result asserts that there is a number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that E^n has a unit vector, say, ξ^n. (See Skeide [Ske09c, Lemma 3.2] for a proof.) If T is linear, then $T^n\colon E^n \to F^n$ fulfills 3 without boundedness. By the preceding paragraph, T^n, and *a fortiori* T, is bounded by $\sqrt{\|\tau(\mathbf{1})\|}$ with the same τ as obtained from T.

Finally, $(T^n)_m = T_{mn,n}\colon M_m(E^n) \to M_m(F^n)$ is bounded by $\sqrt{\|\tau\|}$, since $M_m(E^n)$ has a unit vector (with entries ξ^n in the diagonal) and $\|\tau_m(\mathbf{1}_m)\| = \|\tau(\mathbf{1})\|$. So, T^n, and *a fortiori* T, is completely bounded by $\sqrt{\|\tau\|}$.

We still have to show the last missing statement of Theorem 1.1. We obtain it as a corollary of the proof of Lemma 2.8.

2.13 Lemma. $\|T\|_{cb} \geq \sqrt{\|\tau\|}$.

Proof. Let bb^* be in the unitball of $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\|\tau(bb^*)\| \approx \|\tau\|$. By the proof of Lemma 2.8, there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X^n \in E^n$ with $\|X^n\| \leq \|b\|$ such that $\langle X^n, X^n\rangle \approx bb^*$ and $\langle T^n(X^n), T^n(X^n)\rangle \approx \tau(\langle X^n, X^n\rangle)$. So, $\|\tau\| \approx \|\langle T^n(X^n), T^n(X^n)\rangle\| \leq \|T^n\|^2 \leq \|T\|^2_{cb}$. ■

3 CP-Extendable maps: The KSGNS-construction revisited

In 1 ⇒ 2 we have written down the (strict unital) homomorphism $\vartheta\colon \mathcal{B}^a(E) \to \mathcal{B}^a(F_T)$ in the form $\vartheta := v(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})v^*$ with the unitary $v\colon E \odot \mathcal{F} \to F_T$ granted by the theorem in [Ske10]. Then we have shown that the block-wise map $\mathfrak{T} := \begin{pmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{pmatrix}$ is completely positive, by writing it as $\Xi^*(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})\Xi$ with a *diagonal* map $\Xi \in \mathcal{B}^a\Bigl(\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} \\ F_T \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathscr{B} \\ E \end{pmatrix} \odot \mathcal{F}\Bigr)$. (Recall that it was necessary to unitalize τ if $\mathscr{B}$ was nonunital.) We wish to illustrate that these forms for ϑ and $\mathfrak{T}$ are not accidental, but it actually holds for all strictly CP-extendable maps T.

Let E be a Hilbert $\mathscr{B}$–module, let F be a Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module, and let $\mathfrak{T}\colon \mathcal{B}^a(E) \to \mathcal{B}^a(F)$ a CP-map. Denote by $(\mathcal{E}, \Xi)$ the GNS-construction for $\mathfrak{T}$. Like every Hilbert $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$–module, we may embed $\mathcal{E}$ into $\mathcal{B}^a(F, \mathcal{E} \odot F)$ by identifying $X \in \mathcal{E}$ with the map $X \odot \mathsf{id}_F\colon y \mapsto X \odot y$ and adjoint $X^* \odot \mathsf{id}_F\colon X' \odot y \mapsto \langle X, X'\rangle y$. So, $\mathfrak{T}(a) = \Xi^*(a \odot \mathsf{id}_F)\Xi$ where $a \in \mathcal{B}^a(E)$ acts by the canonical left action on the factor $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathcal{E} \odot F$.

3.1 Lemma. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *$\mathfrak{T}$ is **strict**, that is, bounded strictly converging nets in $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ are sent to strictly converging nets in $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$.*
2. *The action of $\mathcal{K}(E)$ on the $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{E} \odot F$ is nondegenerate.*
3. *The left action of the $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{E} \odot F$ defines a strict homomorphism.*

Proof. Recall that a correspondence, by definition, has nondegenerate left action, so that id_E acts as identity. It is well-known (and easy to show) that 2 and 3 are equivalent for every $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence. (Indeed, since a bounded approximate unit for $\mathcal{K}(E)$ converges strictly to id_E, for a strict left action the compacts must act nondegenerately. And if $\mathcal{K}(E)$ acts nondegenerately, then this action extends to a unique action of all $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ that is strict, automatically. See Lance [Lan95, Proposition 5.8] or the proof of Muhly, Skeide, and Solel [MSS06, Corollary 1.20].) Recall, also, that on bounded subsets, strict and $*$–strong topology coincide. (See [Lan95, Proposition 8.1].)

Now, if the left action of $\mathcal{E} \odot F$ is strict, then for every bounded net $(a_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ converging strictly to a, we have that $(a_\lambda \odot \mathsf{id}_F)(\Xi \odot y)$ converges to $(a \odot \mathsf{id}_F)(\Xi \odot y)$, and likewise for a_λ^*. In other words, $\Xi^*(a_\lambda \odot \mathsf{id}_F)\Xi$ converges $*$–strongly, hence, strictly to $\Xi^*(a \odot \mathsf{id}_F)\Xi$. So, 3 ⇒ 1.

Conversely, suppose $\mathfrak{T}$ is strict, and choose a bounded approximate unit $(u_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ for $\mathcal{K}(E)$. Then for every element $a\Xi \odot y$ from the total subset $\mathcal{B}^a(E)\Xi \odot y$ of $\mathcal{E} \odot F$, we have

$$|(u_\lambda a - a)\Xi \odot y|^2 \;=\; \langle y, \mathfrak{T}((u_\lambda a - a)^*(u_\lambda a - a))y\rangle \;\longrightarrow\; 0,$$

so that $\lim_\lambda (u_\lambda \odot \mathsf{id}_F)(a\Xi \odot y) = \lim_\lambda u_\lambda a\Xi \odot y = a\Xi \odot y$. This shows 1 ⇒ 2. ■

We now define the $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{F} := E^* \odot \mathcal{E} \odot F$. If $\mathfrak{T}$ is strict so that $E \odot E^* \cong \mathcal{K}(E)$ acts nondegenerately on $\mathcal{E} \odot F$, then the string

$$\mathcal{E} \odot F = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\, \mathcal{K}(E)(\mathcal{E} \odot F) \cong \mathcal{K}(E) \odot (\mathcal{E} \odot F) \cong (E \odot E^*) \odot (\mathcal{E} \odot F) = E \odot (E^* \odot \mathcal{E} \odot F) = E \odot \mathcal{F}$$

of (canonical) identifications proves that the map $(x' x^*)(X \odot y) \mapsto x' \odot (x^* \odot X \odot y)$ defines an isomorphism $\mathcal{E} \odot F \to E \odot \mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondences. To obtain the following theorem, we simply have to put the preceding considerations together.[c]

3.2 Theorem. *Let E be a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module, let F be a Hilbert $\mathcal{C}$–module, and suppose that $\mathfrak{T} \colon \mathcal{B}^a(E) \to \mathcal{B}^a(F)$ is a strict CP-map. Then there exist a $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{F}$ and a map $\Xi \in \mathcal{B}^a(F, E \odot \mathcal{F})$ such that $\Xi^*(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})\Xi = \mathfrak{T}$.*

3.3 Remark. For $E = \mathcal{B}$ so that $\mathcal{B}^a(\mathcal{B}) = M(\mathcal{B})$, the *multiplier algebra* of $\mathcal{B}$, this result is known as ***KSGNS-construction*** for a strict CP-map from $\mathcal{B}$ into $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$ (Kasparov [Kas80]); see Lance [Lan95, Theorem 5.6]. One may consider Theorem 3.2 as a consequence of the KSGNS-construction applied to $\mathfrak{T} \upharpoonright \mathcal{K}(E)$ and the representation theory of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ from Muhly, Skeide, and Solel [MSS06]. Effectively, when $\mathfrak{T}$ is a strict unital homomorphism, so that $\mathcal{E} = {}_{\mathfrak{T}}\mathcal{B}^a(F)$ and $\mathcal{F} := E^* \odot \mathcal{E} \odot F = E^* \odot_{\mathfrak{T}} F$, the theorem (and its proof) specialize to [MSS06, Theorem 1.4] (and its proof). We like to view Theorem 3.2 a joint generalization of the KSGNS-construction **and** of the representation theory, and the rapid joint proof shows that this point of view is an advantage.

3.4 Observation. Like with all GNS- and Stinespring type constructions, also here we have suitable uniqueness statements. The GNS-correspondence $\mathcal{E}$ together with the cyclicity condition $\mathcal{E} = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\, \mathcal{B}^a(E) \Xi \mathcal{B}^a(F)$ is unique up to (cyclic-vector-intertwining) isomorphism of correspondences. Of course, this turns over to $\mathcal{E} \odot F$ with the cyclic map $\Xi \in \mathcal{B}^a(F, \mathcal{E} \odot F)$ as with Stinespring construction (as mentioned many times in the sequel of Bhat and Skeide [BS00, Example 2.16] when $F = H$ is a Hilbert space). As for uniqueness of $\mathcal{F}$, this requires fullness of E. Indeed, since $\mathcal{E} \odot F$ with its action of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ is determined up unitary equivalence, [MSS06, Theorem 1.8 and Remark 1.9] tell us, that $\mathcal{F}$ is unique if E is full, and may fail to be unique if E is not full.

---

[c] This way to construct the $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{F}$ from a $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{B}^a(F)$–correspondence is, actually, from Bhat, Liebscher, and Skeide [BLS08, Section 3]. There, however, it is incorrectly claimed that the GNS-correspondence of a strict CP-map has strict left action. (This is false, in general, as the maps $\mathfrak{T} = \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{B}^a(E)}$ shows. The results in [BLS08] are, however, correct, as strictness is never used for $\mathcal{E}$ but always only in the combination as tensor product $\mathcal{E} \odot F$.) For that reason, we preferred to discuss this here carefully, including also the precise statements in Lemma 3.1.

3.5 Corollary. *Suppose* $E = \begin{pmatrix} E_1 \\ E_2 \end{pmatrix}$ *and* $F = \begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \end{pmatrix}$. *Then the strict CP-map* $\mathscr{T}$ *acts block-wise from* $\mathscr{B}^a(E) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathscr{B}^a(E_1) & \mathscr{B}^a(E_2,E_1) \\ \mathscr{B}^a(E_1,E_2) & \mathscr{B}^a(E_2) \end{pmatrix}$ *to* $\mathscr{B}^a(F) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathscr{B}^a(F_1) & \mathscr{B}^a(F_2,F_1) \\ \mathscr{B}^a(F_1,F_2) & \mathscr{B}^a(F_2) \end{pmatrix}$ *if and only if the map* Ξ *in Theorem 3.2 has the diagonal form* $\Xi = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & \\ & \xi_2 \end{pmatrix}$

We skip the simple proof.

Now, suppose $\mathscr{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{pmatrix} \colon \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathscr{B}^a(E) \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & F^* \\ F & \mathscr{B}^a(F) \end{pmatrix}$ is a block-wise CP-map with strict 22–corner ϑ. There is no harm in assuming that $\mathcal{C}$ is unital. And if $\mathcal{B}$ is not unital, unitalize τ. For unital $\mathcal{B}$, the extended linking algebra is $\mathscr{B}^a\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} \\ E \end{pmatrix}$ and the strict topology of all corners but $\mathscr{B}^a(E)$, coincides with the norm topology. Therefore, $\mathscr{T}$ is strict. So, except for the possibly necessary unitalization, we see that the form we used in the proof 1 ⇒ 2 to establish that the constructed $\mathscr{T}$ is completely positive, actually, is also necessary. (If unitalization is necessary, then ξ_1 is an element of a $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$–$\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$–correspondence.) We arrive at the factorization theorem for strictly CP-extendable maps, which is the analogue to the theorem in Skeide [Ske10].

3.6 Theorem. *Let* $\mathcal{B}$ *be a unital* C^**–algebra and let* $\mathcal{C}$ *be a* C^**–algebra. Then for a map* T *from a Hilbert* $\mathcal{B}$*–module* E *to a Hilbert* $\mathcal{C}$*–module* F *the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. T *admits a strict block-wise extension to a CP-map* $\mathscr{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{pmatrix} \colon \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathscr{B}^a(E) \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} & F^* \\ F & \mathscr{B}^a(F) \end{pmatrix}$.
2. *There exists a* $\mathcal{B}$*–*$\mathcal{C}$*–correspondence* $\mathscr{F}$*, an element* $\xi_1 \in \mathscr{F}$ *and a map* $\xi_2 \in \mathscr{B}^a(F, E \odot \mathscr{F})$ *such that* $T = \xi_2^*(\bullet \odot \xi_1)$.

As for a criterion that consists in looking just at T, we reluctant to expect too much. Clearly, such a T must be completely bounded. By appropriate application of Paulsen [Pau86, Lemma 7.1], T should extend to the operator system $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1} & E^* \\ E & \mathbb{C}\mathsf{id}_E \end{pmatrix} \subset \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & E^* \\ E & \mathscr{B}^a(E) \end{pmatrix}$. But to extend this further, we would have to tackle problems like extending CP-maps from an operator systems to the C^*–algebra containing it. We do not know if the special algebraic structure will allow to find a solution to out specific problem. But, in general, existence of such extensions is only granted if the codomain is an injective C^*–algebra. We do not follow the question in these notes.

We close this section with an alternative proof of 2 ⇒ 1 of Theorem 1.3.

3.7 Corollary. *In the situation of 2 of Theorem 1.3,* T *is a* $T^* \odot T$*–map.*

Proof. Recall that the proof 2 ⇒ 3 shows us that ϑ is unital and strict. Unitalizing if necessary, we get ξ_1 and ξ_2. Since ϑ is a unital homomorphism, ξ_2 must be an isometry with $\xi_2\xi_2^*$ commuting with all $a \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathscr{F}}$. Since our specific ξ_2 fulfills $\overline{\mathsf{span}}(\mathscr{B}^a(E) \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathscr{F}})\xi_2 F_T = E \odot \mathscr{F}$, it is unitary. We get $\|\langle T^n(X^n), T^n(X'^n)\rangle\| = \|\langle X^n \odot \xi_1, X'^n \odot \xi_1\rangle\| \leq \|\tau\| \, \|\langle X^n, X'^n\rangle\|^2$, so $T^* \odot T$ is bounded. ■

We think that it is the class of strictly CP-extendable maps that truly merits to be called ***CP-maps*** between Hilbert modules, and not the more restricted class of CP-H-extendable maps.

4 An application: CPH-semigroups

Since Asadi draw attention to τ–maps $T\colon E \to \mathcal{B}(G,H)$ for CP-maps $\tau\colon \mathscr{B} \to \mathcal{B}(G)$, it is an open question what they might be good for. In this section, we make the first attempt to give them an interpretation; and our point is to interpret them as a notion that generalizes dilation of a CP-map $\tau\colon \mathscr{B} \to \mathscr{C}$ to a homomorphism $\vartheta\colon \mathcal{B}^a(E) \to \mathcal{B}^a(F)$.

Suppose $\mathscr{B}$ is unital. Let $\tau\colon \mathscr{B} \to \mathscr{C}$ be a CP-map and denote by $(\mathcal{F},\zeta)$ its GNS-construction. Then $T\colon b \mapsto b\zeta$ is already an example for a τ–map from $\mathscr{B}$ to $\mathcal{F}$. More generally, for each Hilbert $\mathscr{B}$–module E, the map $T_{E,\tau}\colon x \mapsto x \odot \zeta$ is a τ–map $E \to E \odot \mathcal{F}$. Moreover, the theorem in [Ske10] asserts that every τ–map $T\colon E \to F$ factors through the map $T_{E,\tau}$ as $T = vT_{E,\tau}$ via a (unique) isometry $v\colon E \odot \mathcal{F} \to F$. If $F_T = F$, then v is a unitary. In other words, if E and τ are given, then the problem of finding τ–maps defined on E is pretty much determined by $T_{E,\tau}$. It amounts to finding all possibilities to embed $E \odot \mathcal{F}$ isometricly into a Hilbert $\mathscr{C}$–module F. Minimal versions with $F_T = F$ are determined up to unitary equivalence.

In Theorem 1.3, we have learned how to check if a map $T\colon E \to F$ is a τ–map for some τ (without *a priori* knowing that τ), provided E is full (in which case, τ also is unique). Among the criteria there was the property that T is completely bounded and induces an (automatically strict and unital) left action of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ on F_T via $aT(x) = T(ax)$. Starting with a τ–map, if v is adjointable (in other words, if F_T is complemented in F), then $\vartheta\colon a \mapsto v(a \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})v^*$ is a strict homomorphism from $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ to $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$ giving back the left action as $aT(x) = \vartheta(a)T(x)$. Now, if ξ is a unit vector (that is, $\langle \xi,\xi\rangle = \mathbf{1}$) in E, we may define the representation $b \mapsto \xi b \xi^*$ of $\mathscr{B}$ on E. We find

$$\langle v(\xi \odot \zeta), \vartheta(\xi b \xi^*) v(\xi \odot \zeta)\rangle \;=\; \langle \xi \odot \zeta, (\xi b \xi^* \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})(\xi \odot \zeta)\rangle \;=\; \langle \zeta, b\zeta\rangle \;=\; \tau(b). \tag{4.1}$$

so that the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{B} \arrow[r, "\tau"] \arrow[d, "\xi\bullet\xi^*"'] & \mathscr{C} \\
\mathcal{B}^a(E) \arrow[r, "\vartheta"'] & \mathcal{B}^a(F) \arrow[u, "{\langle v(\xi\odot\zeta),\bullet v(\xi\odot\zeta)\rangle}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

It is clear that just any quintuple $(\mathcal{F},\zeta,E,v,\xi)$ of a $\mathscr{B}$–$\mathscr{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{F}$, an element $\zeta \in \mathcal{F}$, a Hilbert $\mathscr{B}$–module E, an adjointable isometry $v\colon E \odot \mathcal{F} \to F$, and a unit vector $\xi \in E$ will do, if we put $\tau := \langle \zeta, \bullet\zeta\rangle$ and $\vartheta := v(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}})v^*$.

If also ζ is a unit vector (so that τ is unital, and also $v(\xi \odot \zeta)$ is a unit vector), such a situation is called a ***weak dilation*** of the ***Markov map*** (that is, unital CP-map) τ. Here weak is referring to that the embedding $\mathscr{B} \to \xi\mathscr{B}\xi^*$ means identifying $\mathscr{B}$ with a corner in $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ (and likewise $\mathscr{C} \to (\xi \odot \zeta)\mathscr{C}(\xi \odot \zeta)^*$) and $\xi\xi^* \bullet \xi\xi^* = \xi\langle \xi, \bullet\xi\rangle\xi^*$ is just the conditional expectation onto that corner (and likewise for the corner of $\mathcal{B}^a(F)$ isomorphic to $\mathscr{C}$).

What, if we do not have a unit vector in E or if τ is not unital? Let us make two observations: Firstly, as long as ξ is a unit vector, the condition that the preceding diagram commutes is actually equivalent to the apparently stronger condition that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{B} \arrow[r, "\tau"] & \mathcal{C} \\
\mathcal{B}^a(E) \arrow[u, "\langle \xi, \bullet \xi \rangle"] \arrow[r, "\vartheta"'] & \mathcal{B}^a(F) \arrow[u, "\langle v(\xi \odot \zeta), \bullet v(\xi \odot \zeta) \rangle"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes. For this, ζ need not be a unit vector. (In fact, substituting in (4.1) $\xi b \xi^*$ with a, the same computation yields $\langle v(\xi \odot \zeta), \vartheta(a) v(\xi \odot \zeta) \rangle = \tau(\langle \xi, a\xi \rangle)$, and inserting $a = \xi b \xi^*$ gives back the original equation.) Secondly, in the expectation the τ–map $T := v(\bullet \odot \zeta)$ occurs as $\langle v(\xi \odot \zeta), \bullet v(\xi \odot \zeta) \rangle = \langle T(\xi), \bullet T(\xi) \rangle$. In this form, the diagram makes sense also if we replace the ξ on the left and the ξ on the right with an arbitrary pairs of elements of E.

4.1 Definition. Let $\tau\colon \mathscr{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ be a CP-map. A homomorphism $\vartheta\colon \mathcal{B}^a(E) \to \mathcal{B}^a(F)$ is a ***CPH-dilation*** of τ if E is full and if there is a map $T\colon E \to F$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{B} \arrow[r, "\tau"] & \mathcal{C} \\
\mathcal{B}^a(E) \arrow[u, "\langle x, \bullet x' \rangle"] \arrow[r, "\vartheta"'] & \mathcal{B}^a(F) \arrow[u, "\langle T(x), \bullet T(x') \rangle"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes for all $x, x' \in E$. (We do not require that $\mathscr{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are unital.) If E is not necessarily full, then we speak of a ***CPH-quasidilation***. A CPH-(quasi)dilation is ***strict*** if ϑ is strict. A CPH-(quasi)dilation is a ***CPH$_0$-(quasi)dilation*** if ϑ is unital.

Excluding the case to have only a quasidilation, means that the dilation tells us enough about the dilated map τ to recover it. (Without that, E may be very well $\{0\}$.) Of course, a CPH-dilation may be turned into a CPH$_0$-dilation, by replacing F with $\vartheta(\mathsf{id}_E)F$. It is strict if and only if $\vartheta(\mathsf{id}_E)F = \overline{\mathsf{span}}\, \vartheta(\mathcal{K}(E))F$. In a CPH-quasidilation, the diagram does not give any information about the component of $T(x)$ in $(\vartheta(\mathsf{id}_E)F)^\perp$. In that case, it is convenient to replace T with $\vartheta(\mathsf{id}_E)T$ and apply the following results to the latter map considered as map into $\vartheta(\mathsf{id}_E)F$.

4.2 Proposition. *If ϑ is a CPH$_0$-quasidilation of a CP-map τ, then every map T making the diagram commute is a τ–map fulfilling $T(ax) = \vartheta(a)T(x)$.*

Proof. Inserting $a = \mathsf{id}_E$ into the diagram, we see that T is a τ–map. Also, for arbitrary $a \in \mathcal{B}^a(E)$ and $x, x' \in E$, we get $\langle T(x), \vartheta(a)T(x') \rangle = \langle T(x), T(ax') \rangle$. A brief argument shows that this implies $\vartheta(a)T(x) = T(ax)$. (Indeed, on $F_T := \overline{\mathsf{span}}\, T(E)\mathcal{C} \subset F$, we know we get a (strict, unital) representation $\vartheta_T\colon \mathcal{B}^a(E) \to \mathcal{B}^a(F_T)$ that acts on the generating subset $T(E)$ in the stated way. That is, we have $\langle y, \vartheta(a)y' \rangle = \langle y, \vartheta_T(a)y' \rangle$ for all $y, y' \in F_T$. From this, one easily verifies that $|\vartheta(a)y - \vartheta_T(a)y|^2 = 0$, so, $\vartheta(a)y = \vartheta_T(a)y$ for all $y \in F_T$.) ■

Form now on we shall assume that $\mathcal{B}$ is **unital**.

4.3 Theorem. *If ϑ is a strict CPH$_0$-dilation of a CP-map τ, then every map T making the diagram commute is a strictly CPH$_0$-map.*

Proof. We shall show that $\mathfrak{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau & T^* \\ T & \vartheta \end{pmatrix}$ is CP, so that T is strictly CPH$_0$. We wish to imitate the proof of complete positivity in the step 1 ⇒ 2 in Section 2. But we have to face the problem that the multiplicity correspondence of ϑ does no longer coincide with the GNS-correspondence of τ; it just contains it.

Denote by $(\mathcal{F}_\tau, \zeta)$ the GNS-construction for τ. Doing the representation theory for the strict unital homomorphism ϑ, we get a $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondence $\mathcal{F}_\vartheta := E^* \odot_\vartheta F$ and a unitary $v \colon E \odot \mathcal{F}_\vartheta \to F, x' \odot (x^* \odot y) \mapsto \vartheta(x'x^*)y$ such that $\vartheta = v(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^*$. By Proposition 4.2, one easily verifies that

$$\langle x, x' \rangle \zeta \longmapsto x^* \odot T(x')$$

determines a bilinear unitary from $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ onto $E^* \odot F_T \subset \mathcal{F}_\vartheta$. We shall identify $\mathcal{F}_\tau \subset \mathcal{F}_\vartheta$, so that $\zeta \in \mathcal{F}_\vartheta$. We have

$$v(x \odot \langle x', x'' \rangle \zeta) = v(x \odot (x'^* \odot T(x''))) = \vartheta(xx'^*)T(x'') = T(x\langle x', x'' \rangle).$$

Substituting $\langle x'.x'' \rangle$ with an approximate unit in $\mathsf{span}\langle E, E \rangle$ for $\mathcal{B}$, it follows that $T(x) = v(x \odot \zeta)$.

Since F_T need not be complemented in F, also $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ need not be complemented in $\mathcal{F}_\vartheta$. But, we still have a map $\begin{pmatrix} \zeta & \\ & v^* \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}^r\left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C} \\ F \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} \\ E \end{pmatrix} \odot \mathcal{F}_\vartheta\right)$. We find

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} b & x^* \\ x' & a \end{pmatrix} \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta}\right)\begin{pmatrix} \zeta & \\ & v^* \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} c \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b\zeta c + (x^* \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y \\ x' \odot \zeta c + (a \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y \end{pmatrix},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \left(\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & x_1^* \\ x_1' & a_1 \end{pmatrix} \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta}\right)\begin{pmatrix} \zeta & \\ & v^* \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \left(\begin{pmatrix} b_2 & x_2^* \\ x_2' & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta}\right)\begin{pmatrix} \zeta & \\ & v^* \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} c_2 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \\
&\quad = c_1^*\langle \zeta, b_1^* b_2 \zeta \rangle c_2 + c_1^* \langle \zeta, b_1^*(x_2^* \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_2 \rangle \\
&\qquad\quad + \langle (x_1^* \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_1, b_2 \zeta \rangle c_2 + \langle (x_1^* \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_1, (x_2^* \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_2 \rangle \\
&\qquad + c_1^* \langle x_1' \odot \zeta, x_2' \odot \zeta \rangle c_2 + c_1^* \langle x_1' \odot \zeta, (a_2 \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_2 \rangle \\
&\qquad\quad + \langle (a_1 \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_1, x_2' \odot \zeta \rangle c_2 + \langle (a_1 \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_1, (a_2 \odot \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{F}_\vartheta})v^* y_2 \rangle \\
&\quad = c_1^* \tau(b_1^* b_2) c_2 + c_1^* \langle T(x_2 b_1), y_2 \rangle + \langle y_1, T(x_1 b_2) \rangle c_2 + \langle y_1, \vartheta(x_1 x_2^*) y_2 \rangle \\
&\qquad + c_1^* \tau(\langle x_1', x_2' \rangle) c_2 + c_1^* \langle T(a_2^* x_1'), y_2 \rangle + \langle y_1, T(a_1^* x_2') \rangle c_2 + \langle y_1, \vartheta(a_1^* a_2) y_2 \rangle \\
&\qquad\qquad = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathfrak{T}\left(\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & x_1^* \\ x_1' & a_1 \end{pmatrix}^* \begin{pmatrix} b_2 & x_2^* \\ x_2' & a_2 \end{pmatrix}\right)\begin{pmatrix} c_2 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking appropriate sums of such expressions, we see that $\mathfrak{T}$ is completely positive. ■

T need not be unique, not even up to unitary equivalence.

4.4 Example. Let F be such that $F \oplus F \cong F$ as $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$–$\mathcal{C}$–correspondences. If T is good enough to make the diagram commute, then so is either map T_i sending x to $T(x)$ in the i–component of $F \oplus F$. Essentially, given τ and ϑ, it is undetermined how F_T sits inside F and even $F_T^\perp$ for different T need not be isomorphic.

However, for full E the map T in the diagram fixes the map τ. For instance, if there are maps $T_t\colon E \to E$ that form a semigroup, a ***CPH$_0$-semigroup***, then also the τ_t constructed from each T_t will form a CP-semigroup, the CP-semigroup ***associated*** with the CPH$_0$-semigroup. And if $T(E)$ is "sufficiently" cyclic, then also ϑ has not much choice what it should be. However, even for a single map $T\colon E \to E$ it turns out that cyclicity in the sense $E_T = E$ is too much to be fulfilled. But the powers T^n (not the inflations!) form a semigroup, and using the whole semigroup, in Theorem 4.6 we will be able to find a suitable cyclicity condition that fixes ϑ and all its powers.

For these reasons, we now switch to semigroups. We will, however, discuss rather the ***continuous time case*** $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The ***discrete case*** $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is generally simpler, and creates no problems

Let $\tau = (\tau_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ be a ***Markov semigroup*** (that is, a unital CP-semigroup) on a unital C^*–algebra $\mathcal{B}$. Bhat and Skeide [BS00] provide the following.

- A ***product system*** $E^\odot = (E_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ of $\mathcal{B}$–correspondences. That is, $E_0 = \mathcal{B}$ (the trivial $\mathcal{B}$–correspondence), and there are bilinear unitaries $u_{s,t}\colon E_s \odot E_t \to E_{s+t}$ such that the ***product*** $(x_s, y_t) \mapsto x_s y_t := u_{s,t}(x_s \odot y_t)$ is associative such that $u_{0,t}$ and $u_{t,0}$ are left and right action, respectively, of $\mathcal{B} = E_0$ on E_t.

- A ***unit*** $\xi^\odot = (\xi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ (that is, the elements $\xi_t \in E_t$ fulfill $\xi_0 = \mathbf{1}$ and $\xi_s \xi_t = \xi_{s+t}$), such that

  $$\tau_t = \langle \xi_t, \bullet \xi_t \rangle,$$

  and the smallest product subsystem of $E^\odot$ containing $\xi^\odot$ is $E^\odot$. (The pair $(E^\odot, \xi^\odot)$ is determined by these properties up to unit-preserving isomorphism, and we refer to it as the ***GNS-construction*** for τ with ***GNS-system*** $E^\odot$ and ***cyclic unit*** $\xi^\odot$.)

- A ***left dilation*** $v_t\colon E \odot E_t \to E$ of $E^\odot$ to E. That is, a Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module E is full, and unitaries such that the ***product*** $(x, y_t) \mapsto x y_t := v_t(x \odot y_t)$ iterates associatively with the product system product.

  It is readily verified that the maps $\vartheta_t\colon a \mapsto v_t(a \odot \mathsf{id}_t) v_t^*$ define an ***E_0–semigroup*** (that is, a semigroup of unital endomorphisms) of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ that is ***strict*** (that is, every ϑ_t is strictly continuous on bounded subsets).

- A ***unit vector*** $\xi \in E$ such that $\xi \xi_t = \xi$.

It is readily verified that the triple (E, ϑ, ξ) is a ***weak dilation*** of τ in the sense that

$$\langle \xi, \vartheta_t(\xi b \xi^*)\xi \rangle \;=\; \tau_t(b).$$

In other words, if we define the projection $p := \xi\xi^* \in \mathcal{B}^a(E)$ and identify $\mathscr{B}$ with the corner $\xi\mathscr{B}\xi^* = p\mathcal{B}^a(E)p$ of $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$, then $p\vartheta_t(a)p = \tau_t(pap) \in \mathcal{B}^a(E)$.

Also, the dilation constructed in[BS00] is ***minimal*** in the sense that the subsets ξE_t increase to a dense submodule of E. This means that the smallest submodule of E containing ξ and invariant for all $\vartheta_t(\xi b \xi^*)$, is E. Also such a minimal dilation is unique up to suitable unitary equivalence.

- Only for the preceding part, it is necessary that τ is Markov. The GNS-system with generating unit exists as long as $\mathscr{B}$ is unital. If $\mathscr{B}$ in nonunital, then still the GNS-system exists, but the concept of *unit* is undefined.

Now, if we define $T_t(x) := x\xi_t$, we see that we see that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{B} \arrow[r, "\tau_t"] & \mathscr{B} \\
\mathcal{B}^a(E) \arrow[r, "\vartheta_t"'] \arrow[u, "\langle x, \bullet x' \rangle"] & \mathcal{B}^a(E) \arrow[u, "\langle T_t(x), \bullet T_t(x') \rangle"']
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.2}$$

commutes for all $x, x' \in E$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The special property of the dilation from [BS00] is the existence of the unit vector $\xi \in E$ fulfilling $\xi\xi_t = \xi$. But for that the diagram commutes, effectively just any left dilation v_t will do. For any product system $E^\odot$, any unit $\xi^\odot$ and any left dilation $v_t \colon E \odot E_t \to E$ to a full Hilbert $\mathscr{B}$–module E (so that all E_t are necessarily full, too), the formulae $\tau_t := \langle \xi_t, \bullet \xi_t \rangle$, $\vartheta_t := v_t(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_t)v_t^*$, and $T_t(x) := x\xi_t$ provide us with a strict CPH$_0$-dilation of τ_t. For this it is not necessary that the τ_t form a Markov semigroup. Of course, also the corresponding $\mathcal{T}_t$ form a (strict) CP-semigroup (which is Markov if and only if τ_t is Markov).

4.5 Definition. An E_0–semigroup ϑ on $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ for a full Hilbert $\mathscr{B}$–module E is a ***CPH$_0$-dilation*** of a CP-semigroup τ on $\mathscr{B}$ if there exists a CPH$_0$-semigroup T on E making Diagram (4.2) commute for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. (We use all variants as in Definition 4.1.)

If τ_t is not Markov, then [BS00] provide a weak dilation to an E–semigroup (that is a semigroup of not necessarily unital endomorphisms). But τ_t cannot posses a weak dilation to an E_0–semigroup. On the contrary, we see that τ_t possesses a CPH$_0$-dilation. All we need for that, is a left dilation of the product system $E^\odot$. Skeide [Ske06a, Ske07, Ske09b, Ske09a] has shown in many variants (unital and nonunital C^*–algebras, von Neumann algebras, with and without continuity conditions), that every full product system admits a left dilation, even if $E^\odot$ has no unital units. Therefore, every pair $(E^\odot, \xi^\odot)$ of a full product system and a unit provides us with a CP-semigroup and CPH$_0$-dilations.

A Markov semigroup has a minimal weak dilation where the module E, the CPH$_0$-semigroup $(T_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}$, and the E_0–semigroup $(\vartheta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}$ are determined uniquely. We now come back to the question of uniqueness of ϑ_t for general CPH$_0$-dilations. We shall see that E itself need not be minimal. It is sufficient that that $E^\odot$ is generated by the unit and that T fulfills a cyclicity condition.

4.6 Theorem. *Let τ be a CP-semigroup on a unital C^*–algebra $\mathcal{B}$, and denote by $(E^\odot, \xi^\odot)$ its GNS-system and cyclic unit. Let E be a full Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$–module. The formula $T_t = v_t(\bullet \odot \xi_t)$ establishes a one-to-one correspondence between:*

1. *Left dilations $v_t \colon E \odot E_t \to E$ of $E^\odot$ to E.*

2. *CPH$_0$-semigroups T on E associated with τ fulfilling the minimality condition*

$$E \;=\; \overline{\mathsf{span}}\Big\{ T_{t_1}(T_{t_2}(\ldots T_{t_n}(x)b_{n-1}\ldots)b_1)b_0 \colon n \in \mathbb{N}, t_1 + \ldots + t_n = t, b_i \in \mathcal{B}, x \in E \Big\} \qquad (4.3)$$

   for all $t > 0$.

In either case, ϑ with $\vartheta_t = v_t(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_t)v_t^*$ is the unique strict CPH$_0$-dilation of τ with the CPH$_0$-semigroup T making Diagram (4.2) *commute.*

Proof. Let v_t be a left dilation. Then the τ_t–maps $T_t := v_t(\bullet \odot \xi_t)$ define a CPH$_0$-semigroup T on E. Since

$$E_t \;=\; \overline{\mathsf{span}}\{b_n\xi_{t_n}\ldots b_1\xi_{t_1}b_0 \colon n \in \mathbb{N}, t_1 + \ldots + t_n = t, b_i \in \mathcal{B}\},$$

we see that

$$T_{t_1}(T_{t_2}(\ldots T_{t_n}(x)b_{n-1}\ldots)b_1)b_0 \;=\; x\xi_{t_n}\ldots b_1\xi_{t_1}b_0$$

is indeed total in $v_t(E \odot E_t) = E$. Conversely, if T is CPH$_0$-semigroup, we easily see that

$$v_t \colon x \odot \xi_{t_n}\ldots b_1\xi_{t_1}b_0 \;\longmapsto\; T_{t_1}(T_{t_2}(\ldots T_{t_n}(x)b_{n-1}\ldots)b_1)b_0$$

defines an isometry, which is unitary if (and only if) the second condition is satisfied. Of course, $v_t(x \odot \xi_t) = T_t(x)$ so that the two directions are inverses of each other. Finally, by Proposition 4.2, the ϑ_t completing Diagram (4.2), fulfill $\vartheta_t(a)T_t(x) = T_t(ax)$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta_t(a)T_{t_1}(T_{t_2}(\ldots T_{t_n}(x)b_{n-1}\ldots)b_1)b_0 \;&=\; T_{t_1}(\vartheta_{t-t_1}(a)T_{t_2}(\ldots T_{t_n}(x)b_{n-1}\ldots)b_1)b_0 \\ &=\; \ldots \;=\; T_{t_1}(T_{t_2}(\ldots T_{t_n}(ax)b_{n-1}\ldots)b_1)b_0,\end{aligned}$$

that is, $\vartheta_t = v_t(\bullet \odot \mathsf{id}_t)v_t^*$. ■

4.7 Definition. A CPH$_0$-semigroup T on a full Hilbert $\mathscr{B}$–module E is ***minimal*** if it fulfills (4.3) for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We call ϑ from the theorem the E_0–semigroup ***associated*** with T. We refer to the pair (T, ϑ) as a ***minimal*** CPH$_0$-dilation of the associated CP-semigroup τ.

4.8 Observation. From Theorem 4.6, it follows that starting with just a minimal CPH$_0$-semigroup T on a full E, we get the associated CP-semigroup τ (with $\tau_t := T_t^* \odot T_t$) and the unique CPH$_0$-dilation ϑ of τ. It might be worth comparing these results with Heo and Ji [HJ11].

A minimal CPH$_0$-dilation of a CP-semigroup τ is not unique, since E to which the GNS-system of τ is dilated, is usually not unique. But even if E is fixed, there is no uniqueness. Indeed, by Skeide [Ske02, Ske09a], different strict E_0–semigroups on the same $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ with the same product system $E^\odot$, are cocycle conjugate. It is easy to see that two minimal CPH$_0$-semigroups T and T' on the same full Hilbert $\mathscr{B}$–module that extend by their associated E_0–semigroup to a CPH$_0$-dilation of the same CP-semigroup τ, are related by the unique local cocycle that intertwines T and T', and every nontrivial unitary local cocycle gives a pair that is not unitarily equivalent.

We leave questions about the relation with general cocycles and CPH$_0$-semigroups to possibly different CP-semigroups to a detailed investigation in the future.

Let us have a different look at Diagram (4.2). Note that the map $\mathfrak{K}\colon (x, x') \mapsto \mathfrak{K}^{x,x'} := \langle x, \bullet x' \rangle$ is a ***completely positive definite*** or ***CPD-kernel*** over the set E from $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ to $\mathscr{B}$ in the sense of Barreto, Bhat, Liebscher, and Skeide [BBLS04, Section 3.2]; see also the survey Skeide [Ske11]. The map T_t amounts to a transformation of the indexing set E. We may generalize CPH-dilation of a CP-semigroup τ on $\mathscr{B}$ to the situation

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{B} \arrow[r, "\tau_t"] & \mathscr{B} \\
\mathscr{A} \arrow[u, "\mathfrak{K}^{\sigma,\sigma'}"] \arrow[r, "\theta_t"'] & \mathscr{A} \arrow[u, "\mathfrak{K}^{T_t(\sigma),T_t(\sigma')}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

where θ is an endomorphism semigroup on a unital C^*–algebra $\mathscr{A}$ and where $\mathfrak{K}$ is a fixed CPD-kernel over S from $\mathscr{A}$ to $\mathscr{B}$. Note, however, that this situation is not too much more general. Effectively, $\mathfrak{K}$ has a Kolmogorov decomposition $(E, \varkappa)$ consisting of an $\mathscr{A}$–$\mathscr{B}$–correspondence E and a map $\varkappa\colon S \to E$ such that $\mathfrak{K}^{\sigma,\sigma'} = \langle \varkappa(\sigma), \bullet \varkappa(\sigma') \rangle$ and $E = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\, \mathscr{A}\varkappa(S)\mathscr{B}$.

A natural question is if T_t extends as a map $E \to E$ (automatically a τ_t–map). Another question is if $\mathscr{A}$ is $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$.

We also may ask, if this setting has a useful interpretation in terms of Morita equivalence. If $\mathscr{A} = \mathcal{B}^a(E)$, then $\mathcal{K}(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $\mathscr{B}$. We may say, $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$ is strictly Morita equivalent to $\mathscr{B}$. The CPD-kernel somehow encodes the necessary information about the Morita equivalence transform. How is the transform T_t reflected in the picture of Morita equivalence? Is the Kolmogorov construction for $\mathfrak{K}^{T_t(\sigma),T_t(\sigma')}$ in a reasonable way contained in E?

Of course, Morita equivalence is invertible. Is the "inverse" CPD-kernel $\mathfrak{L}$ from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ defined by $\mathfrak{L}^{x',x}(b) := x'bx^*$ of any use?

Also answers to these questions will have to wait for future investigation.

Acknowledgments: This work grew out of a six months stay during the first named author's sabbatical in 2010 and a three months stay in 2012 at ISI Bangalore. He wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Bhat and the ISI Bangalore for warm hospitality and the Dipartimento S.E.G.e S. of the University of Molise as well as the Italian MIUR (PRIN 2007) for taking over travel expenses. The second named author expresses his gratitude to Professor Bhat for his gracious encouragement.

References

[Arv89] W. Arveson, *Continuous analogues of Fock space*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., no. 409, American Mathematical Society, 1989.

[AS07] G. Abbaspour and M. Skeide, *Generators of dynamical systems on Hilbert modules*, Commun. Stoch. Anal. **1** (2007), 193–207, (arXiv: math.OA/0611097).

[Asa09] M.B. Asadi, *Stinespring's theorem for Hilbert C^*–modules*, J. Operator Theory **62** (2009), 235–238.

[BBLS04] S.D. Barreto, B.V.R. Bhat, V. Liebscher, and M. Skeide, *Type I product systems of Hilbert modules*, J. Funct. Anal. **212** (2004), 121–181, (Preprint, Cottbus 2001).

[BG02] D. Bakic and B. Guljas, *On a class of module maps of Hilbert C^*–modules*, Math. Commun. **7** (2002), 177–192.

[Ble97] D.P. Blecher, *A new approach to Hilbert C^*–modules*, Math. Ann. **307** (1997), 253–290.

[BLS08] B.V.R. Bhat, V. Liebscher, and M. Skeide, *A problem of Powers and the product of spatial product systems*, Quantum Probability and Infinite Dimensional Analysis — Proceedings of the 28th Conference (J.C. Garcia, R. Quezada, and S.B. Sontz, eds.), Quantum Probability and White Noise Analysis, no. XXIII, World Scientific, 2008, (arXiv: 0801.0042v1), pp. 93–106.

[BRS12] B.V.R. Bhat, G. Ramesh, and K. Sumesh, *Stinespring's theorem for maps on Hilbert C^*–modules*, J. Operator Theory **68** (2012), 173–178, (arXiv: 1001.3743v1).

[BS00] B.V.R. Bhat and M. Skeide, *Tensor product systems of Hilbert modules and dilations of completely positive semigroups*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **3** (2000), 519–575, (Rome, Volterra-Preprint 1999/0370).

[HJ11] J. Heo and U.C. Ji, *Quantum stochastic processes for maps on Hilbert C^*–modules*, J. Math. Phys. **52** (2011), 053501 (16pp).

[Joi12] M. Joita, *Covariant representations of Hilbert C^*–modules*, Expo. Math. **30** (2012), 209–220, (arXiv: 1007.3489v4).

[Kas80] G.G. Kasparov, *Hilbert C^*–modules, theorems of Stinespring & Voiculescu*, J. Operator Theory **4** (1980), 133–150.

[Lan95] E.C. Lance, *Hilbert C^*–modules*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[MSS06] P.S. Muhly, M. Skeide, and B. Solel, *Representations of* $\mathcal{B}^a(E)$, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **9** (2006), 47–66, (arXiv: math.OA/0410607).

[Pas73] W.L. Paschke, *Inner product modules over B^*–algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **182** (1973), 443–468.

[Pau86] V.I. Paulsen, *Completely bounded maps and dilations*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, no. 146, Longman Scientific & Technical; John Wiley & Sons, 1986.

[Ske00] M. Skeide, *Generalized matrix C^*–algebras and representations of Hilbert modules*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy **100A** (2000), 11–38, (Cottbus, Reihe Mathematik 1997/M-13).

[Ske02] ______, *Dilations, product systems and weak dilations*, Math. Notes **71** (2002), 914–923.

[Ske06a] ______, *A simple proof of the fundamental theorem about Arveson systems*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **9** (2006), 305–314, (arXiv: math.OA/0602014).

[Ske06b] ______, *Generalized unitaries and the Picard group*, Proc. Ind. Ac. Sc. (Math Sc.) **116** (2006), 429–442, (arXiv: math.OA/0511661).

[Ske07] ______, *E_0–semigroups for continuous product systems*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **10** (2007), 381–395, (arXiv: math.OA/0607132).

[Ske09a] ______, *Classification of E_0–semigroups by product systems*, Preprint, arXiv: 0901.1798v3, 2009.

[Ske09b] ______, *E_0–Semigroups for continuous product systems: The nonunital case*, Banach J. Math. Anal. **3** (2009), 16–27, (arXiv: 0901.1754v1).

[Ske09c] ______, *Unit vectors, Morita equivalence and endomorphisms*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **45** (2009), 475–518, (arXiv: math.OA/0412231v5 (Version 5)).

[Ske10] ______, *A factorization theorem for φ–maps*, Preprint, arXiv: 1005.1396v1, To appear in J. Operator Theory, 2010.

[Ske11] ______, *Hilbert modules—square roots of positive maps*, Quantum Probability and Releated Topics — Proceedings of the 30th Conference (R. Rebolledo and M. Orszag, eds.), Quantum Probability and White Noise Analysis, no. XXVII, World Scientific, 2011, (arXiv: 1007.0113v1), pp. 296–322.

Michael Skeide, *Università degli Studi del Molise, Dipartimento S.E.G.e S., Via de Sanctis 86100 Campobasso, Italy, E-mail:* `skeide@unimol.it`,
Homepage: `http://web.unimol.it/skeide/`.

K. Sumesh, *Indian Statistical Institute Bangalore, R.V. College Post, 8th Mile Mysore Road 560059 Bangalore, India, E-mail:* `sumesh@isibang.ac.in`.